

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, and 27 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at ¶¶ [0063]-[0064] of the published application. Thus, claims 1-18 and 20-27 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In light of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. The Double Patenting Rejections is Acknowledged

Claims 1-18 and 20-27 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 and 20-28 of copending Application No. 10/574,141 and claims 1-22 and 24-35 of copending Application No. 10/574,140. The Applicants acknowledge this **provisional** rejection and will address the rejection if the claims of the applications are deemed allowable and remain subject of a non-provisional double patenting rejection.

III. The Claim Objection Should Be Withdrawn

Claims 1 and 18 stand objected to due to informalities. With respect to the term “optical characteristic” recited in claim 1, the Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to the claim element reciting “a display driver for controlling *an optical characteristic* of each pixel.” This element is recited prior to the objected language of “a predetermined viewing angle dependency of *said optical characteristic*.” In view of the amendments to these claims, the withdrawal of the further objections is respectfully requested.

IV. The 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection Should Be Withdrawn

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claim 27 has been amended to include the language suggested

by the Examiner to over the §101 rejection. (See 11/10/09 Office Action, p. 4). Therefore, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-14, 18, 20-23, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Balogh (U.S. Published App. No. 2001/0028356) in view of Andrade et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,954,193).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, “[a] display device for displaying a three dimensional image such that different views are displayed according to different viewing angles, the display device including: a display panel having a plurality of separately addressable pixels for displaying said image, the pixels being grouped such that different pixels in a group correspond to different views of the image as a function of an angle with respect to a first axis; a display driver for controlling an optical characteristic of each pixel to generate a grey scale image according to received image data; and a grey scale compensation device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels within a group to compensate for a predetermined viewing angle dependency of optical characteristic in a second axis of the display panel, wherein the second axis is transverse to the first axis.”

The Examiner correctly acknowledges that Balogh fails to disclose a grey scale compensation device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels within a group to compensate for a predetermined viewing angle dependency of optical characteristic. (See 11/10/09 Office Action, p. 6). To cure this deficiency, the Examiner refers to Andrade which discloses a method utilizing correction factors to compensate for variation in viewing angles between pixel locations and a user’s viewing position to provide a consistent visual appearance with respect to a viewing position. (See Andrade, col. 4, ll. 12-15). Claim 1 has been amended to recite a “a grey scale compensation device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels within a group to compensate *for a predetermined viewing angle dependency of said optical characteristic in a second axis of the display panel, wherein the second*

axis is transverse to the first axis.” Neither Balogh nor Andrade contain any disclosure or suggestion with respect to a grey scale compensation device operating in a manner analogous to the above recitation of claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Balogh nor Andrade disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1 and that claim 1 is allowable. Because claims 2-14 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable.

Claim 18 contains limitations substantially similar to those of claim 1. Thus it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 and its dependent claims 20-23 and 27 are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons presented with regards to claim 1.

Claims 15-17 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Balogh in view of Andrade and further in view of Mochizuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,386,720).

Mochizuki teaches a light source comprising an acrylic plate in which LEDs serve as a light source at one side of the plate. (See Mochizuki, col. 3, ll. 15-25). A mirror reflects light from the LEDs. The top and bottom surfaces of the plate, which emit the reflected light, are rough. The problem that Mochizuki tries to cure is an increased luminance at the center of the plate and diminished luminance towards the edges of the plate. (See Id., col. 1, ll. 22-27). To remedy this problem, Mochizuki teaches scattering portions that increase in area away from the LEDs along the x-axis. (See Id., col. 5, l. 66-col. 6, l. 1). To compensate for the light distribution in the y-direction, Mochizuki individually adjusts the luminance of each LED. (See Id., col. 6, ll. 10-11). The result is a uniform luminance over the surface of the acrylic plate. (See Id., col. 6, ll. 30-36). Although this cures the luminance problem, it would not cure a view angle dependency. Viewing angle dependency relates to pixels, not light sources. Mochizuki’s resulting display that exhibits a uniform luminance over the entire display would still exhibit a viewing angle dependency. In fact, Mochizuki does not even address the issue of a

viewing angle dependency. Claim 1 recites controlling *light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels*. Mochizuki is only concerned with the problem of irregular luminance not controlling *light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels*. Accordingly, Mochizuki fails to disclose “a grey scale compensation device for further controlling light transmission characteristics of at least some pixels within a group to compensate for a predetermined viewing angle dependency of said optical characteristic in a second axis of the display panel, wherein the second axis is transverse to the first axis,” as recited in claims 1 and 18.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mochizuku fails to cure the deficiencies of Balogh and Andrade and that Balogh, Andrade, and Mochizuku, taken alone or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 18. Because claims 15-17 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable. Because claims 24-26 depend on and, therefore, contain all of the limitations of claim 18, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 11, 2010

By: 

Michael V. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276

Mail all correspondence to:
Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics North America Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9618